

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-9 and 11-26 are pending in this application. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested. Independent claims 1, 25 and 26 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

**Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's indication that claims 3, 10 and 12-14 contain allowable subject matter.

**Objections to the Specification**

The Examiner objects to the disclosure because informalities. Applicant submits a replacement abstract of the disclosure at the end of this document, to correct the typographical error.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw his rejection of the specification.

**Claim Objections**

The Examiner objects to claims 1, 10, 25 and 26 because of minor informalities. Applicant has amended claims 1, 25 and 26 to overcome the Examiner's objections and claim 10 has been cancelled. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw his objections to the claims.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112**

Claims 1 and 26 stand rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner states that the recitation that an element is “adapted to” perform a function is not a positive limitation but only requires the ability to perform. Claims 1 and 26 have been amended to recite elements that are “configured to” perform a function. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101**

Claim 26 stands rejected under 35 USC §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 26 has been amended to clarify that the claim is referring to a software program that is embodied in a computer readable medium.

Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 1, 11, 15, 17-25 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Klein et al. (US 6,760,661). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Klein teaches a navigation device that can be provided with additional information via external sources. The navigation device can receive traffic information such as traffic jam information or other important traffic information linked to standardized coordinates. The navigation device as taught by Klein then displays the planned route along with the traffic information via graphical highlighting. In Klein, a user is able to select an alternative route based on the traffic information and the navigation device will recalculate the new route.

Klein fails to recite at least “wherein the dynamic travel information is represented by a selectable graphical icon or selectable option that, when selected by

touching the icon or option, the device displays a relatively increased amount of detail of the dynamic travel information associated with the selected icon or option." as recited by amended claim 1.

Klein instead teaches that a user can select the traffic jam, select an alternative traffic jam, deselect a traffic jam or by pass the traffic jam. However, when a user selects an option, no additional details are displayed. Thus, as admitted by the Examiner, Klein fails to teach "a selectable graphical icon or selectable option that, when selected by touching the icon or option, the device displays a relatively increased amount of detail of the dynamic travel information associated with the selected icon or option."

Therefore, Applicants submit that Klein fails to teach all the elements as required by independent claim 1. Applicants submit that independent claims 25 and 26 are allowable at least for somewhat similar reasons as stated above with respect to claim 1 (although each claim should be interpreted solely based upon the limitations set forth therein), as well as on its own merits. Applicants further submit that claims 2-9 and 11-24 depend on allowable independent claims and are patentable for the reasons stated above, as well as on their own merits.

Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of the pending claims under 35 U.S.C. §103 be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 4-9 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Klein et al. in view of Ikeda (US 7,027,917). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants submit that Ikeda does not cure the deficiencies as discussed above regarding Klein nor does the Examiner use Ikeda to teach or suggest the features as discussed above with respect to independent claim 1. Applicants have demonstrated

that Klein fails to teach all of the elements of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Klein in view of Ikeda does not render claim 1 obvious to one skilled in the art.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 2, 4-9 and 16 are allowable at least for depending on an allowable base claim. For at least this reason, this rejection should be withdrawn.

**CONCLUSION**

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the objections and rejections and allowance of each of the pending claims in connection with the present application is earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Donald J. Daley at the telephone number of the undersigned below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. §1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By

  
Donald J. Daley, Reg. No. 34,313

P.O. Box 8910  
Reston, Virginia 20195  
(703) 668-8000

  
DJD/EGP/mas